

HS CURRENT CALCULATION

HOT

- Highest poverty schools receive majority of money.
- We've been consistent with this for years.
- Based in reality.
- Our team believes this is the best high school option.
- Reflection of real numbers of kids in poverty.
- Higher per child spending for schools with highest levels of poverty.
- Is true reflection of Seeley HS with larger population of F&R meals.
- Better picture of actual situation.
- Better for Seeley, which has the highest percentage.
- Better for big Sky.

Standing Committee Feedback

- Identify the ones who filled out the forms.
- Open enrollment will not impact this form as well.
- Reflects our poverty percent more accurately.
- Focus our decision-making on what's best for our students.
- Don't have to hound parents to fill out forms.
- The funds stay with the kids in poverty.
- 1133 students total F&R more accurate representation of poverty than 830.
- Based on real numbers.
- Based on actual enrollment.

NOT

- Hellgate loses money.
- Student impact and loss of staff for Hellgate.
- Calculating poverty level based on filling out F&R [application] is not an accurate picture of poverty level.
- Turn-over in our staff.
- We were told we could NOT have a school-wide incentive program to gather free and reduced forms.
- Removing existing support.
- Dropout and poverty rate correlate. Hellgate has highest.
- More impactful to lose a program at one school than to slightly grow another.
- Hellgate grandfathered in – may lose program.

Standing Committee Feedback

- Relies only on F&R forms turned in.
- Not accurate measure of poverty in school.
- Not equitable.
- Understood by DOE to be inaccurate.
- Recommended by policy advisors to change to a more accurate indicator (Alliance for Excellent Education).
- Hard to determine actual enrollment due to open enrollment.
- Cannot use it with Seeley.
- Hellgate will lose money.
- Hard to get students to complete forms.

School Name: _____

HS FEEDER PATTERN CALCULATION

HOT	NOT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeder pattern more accurate picture at the high school level. • Hellgate keeps a program. • Lots of kids don't fill out forms. • Will help graduation rates at Hellgate. • Some parents (who might qualify) don't understand that F&R = academic services • May makeup for people that don't fill out the forms. • Hellgate gets more money. • Hellgate program is more stable. • [In] theory – sounds good. • Hellgate benefits (only). • Hellgate receives funding. • Has been close in the past (Hellgate and Big Sky). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers are not real. Based upon open enrollment statistics, going to a feeder pattern formula does not make sense. • The two Missoula schools with the highest F&R population will lose money. • Huge drop in money for Seeley. • Not an accurate picture of the students in each school because of open enrollment. • Seeley doesn't have family resources that Missoula does for the kids. • Seeley takes a huge hit – almost no program for highest need school. • Grossly unfair reduction in funds to Seeley-Swan (58%). • Feeder formula doesn't allocate higher per child funding for schools in higher poverty bands (as required by Dept of Ed). • Essentially taking highest poverty per capita school and eliminating the academic support programs. • Can't use what the halls look like as a true indicator of poverty level. • Big Sky also takes a huge hit – despite projected increased in F&R percentages. • Seeley-Swan's allocation is not even enough to fund Read 180. • Student impact and loss of funds at Seeley – huge cut. • Not accurate portrayal of poverty. • Enrollment population percentage.
Standing Committee Feedback	Standing Committee Feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hellgate gets more money and retains program. • Paperwork is not an issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSHS/SSHS (two schools with highest F&R numbers) lose money. • SSHS – no other resources in Seeley for F&R students. • Latest numbers

School Name: _____

K-8 INCLUDING PAXSON

HOT

- Kids will receive services that need it.
- They will have an FRC [sic] irregardless.
- More continuous intervention model across district (as students move from building to building).
- \$24,000 that stays with one school has a bigger impact rather than divided up amongst other schools.
- Helping families supporting more students.
- Not huge deduction in funding for other schools.
- Serves more kids.
- Possibly go towards teacher training and family involvement.
- Could use money to get more instructional coaching.

NOT

- Creates a negative dichotomy between Title students and not.
- F&R population are largely situational poverty levels and won't stay there (at the poverty level). Takes away from generational poverty schools. 71% of their incoming Kindergarteners are school ready (DIBELS and letter naming).
- How do you build consistency in a program when your "in" a year and "out" the next year?
- How do high poverty schools plan interventions for students that build from year to year when they lose funding?
- One month of number crunching is not an accurate picture.
- Cuts to all schools.
- Not a significant amount of money to Paxson - \$24,000 doesn't get much.
- Ongoing cuts over time . . . why add when we're losing funds?
- More money to parent involvement.
- Situational versus generational poverty.
- Paxson is under 50% F&R Lunch.
- Makes it a little gray in terms of which school are included.
- Difference in type of poverty: generational versus situational.
- Sustainability and consistency year-to-year.
- \$1,200 comes out of other schools' parent involvement.
- Huge impact on students and parents (Paxson has other avenues that promote parent involvement whereas the other Title schools do not).
- Hard to get a program running on such a low amount of money.
- Pro doesn't outweigh keeping programs in other schools (taking away from another school to its detriment).

Standing Committee Feedback

- Serves Paxson F&R students.
- Supporting generational poverty.
- It's been district policy. They have demonstrated they have the percentage 2 years in a row.

Standing Committee Feedback

- Not consistent. I.E. what happens when/if it drops?
- Half of student population qualifies for F&R.
- Could attribute to different kind of poverty (temporary).
- Not enough funds to hire a full time staff.

School Name: _____

K-8 INCLUDING PAXSON

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sustainable? |
|--|--|

School Name: _____

K-8 NOT INCLUDING PAXSON

HOT

- Incoming DIBELS (K) and all levels don't demonstrate need.
- Several other funding sources coming in (e.g., private donor of iPads and Language Immersion – Washington Corp. grant).
- Paxson doesn't meet or exceed the K-5 district average for F&R. It's only when you include percentages from all 3 middle schools only 1 of which is Title funded when they meet this criteria.
- We can try to maintain our program. It is effective.
- Keeps us at 50% level – very black and white.
- A bit more money for other schools.

Standing Committee Feedback

- \$24,000 impact increase; approximately \$1,000 loss to other schools.
- Keep them off the roller coaster ride (have, don't have, have . . .).
- They won't have to worry about adding and losing programs year to year.

NOT

- Franklin has 39 homeless students. K-8 . . . has 75.
- How do we maintain our intervention pathways when funding is up and down every year?
- One day is not an accurate picture of a school's poverty.
- Mobility 24.4% at 69 kids in and out of building.
- Concerned about the part of student population that comes from impoverished student housing.
- Paxson not served.

Standing Committee Feedback

- Approximately \$1,000 taken away. Longevity of receiving funds/programs.
- You should get funding if you follow the protocol and over average percentage 2 years in a row.

School Name: _____